JULY
AUGUST
1975

WRL NEWS

Published by War Resisters League, 339 Lafayette Street, New York, N.Y. 10012, U.S. branch of the War Resisters Intl., a pacifist organization with affiliates in 20 countries and individuals in more than 80 countries. Staff—Karl Bissinger, Ralph DiGia, Ed Hedemann, Grace Hedemann, David McReynolds, Editor—Jim Peck. Printed by the Grindstone Press, a Movement print shop. No. 189

DEMO AT I.R.S. SEPT. 3

A national demonstration protesting the seizure of Ernest Bromley's house, in particular, and the harassment of Peacemaker, and other political groups, in general, will be held Wednesday, Sept. 3 at IRS headquarters in Washington, D.C. There will be a sit-in, for those prepared to commit civil disobedience, and picketing for those who are not.

For further info, write WRL.

PROTEST MASS ARRESTS IN INDIA

Photo by Karl Bissinger

When we included in last WRL NEWS a supplement on J.P. Narayan and the movement mobilized around him, little did we anticipate that by the next time we went to press he would be under arrest along with hundreds of other political opponents of Indira Gandhi. The above photo shows a protest demonstration organized June 27 by WRL in New York. Similar demos took place in Philadelphia and Los Angeles. Next day's New York Times carried a photo of a pacifist demo in Rome. Others, not reported, probably took place in countries where WRI had chapters. A second demo in New York, this time in cooperation with Indians For Democracy, was conducted July 18 at the Indian Mission to the UN.

WAS THE '69 BURGLARY OF WRL A CIA JOB?

DAILY NEWS front page, exclusive, story June 13 headed "CIA Burglaries in NYC Bared," prompted WRL to demand an immediate investigation to determine whether the CIA was involved in the still-unsolved burglary of the League's office on May 9, 1969.

The demand was made to Mayor Beame, because the DAILY NEWS story established "a clear link between the CIA and the New York City police department." Police had investigated the 1969 burglary, but without results.

The DAILY NEWS story dealt only with " 'selected burglaries' against pro-Castro followers on Manhattan's upper West Side."

But WRL pointed out in its letter to the mayor: "While our organization is not involved in the Cuba issue, it follows that the CIA may well have been involved in other political burglaries here." And the burglary could have been ONLY political, since the only thing stolen was the membership files (both cards and address stencils). Copies of the letter were sent to both the Senate and House committees investigating the CIA.

P.S.—As a consequence of the letter, two police officials came to 339 on July 9 to ask more questions.

ACTION BY ECONOMIC COALITION

Faced with the serious economic crisis, WRL joined other peace and civil rights groups last year in setting up the Coalition On The Economic Crisis. On June 28 CONEC joined with trade union groups in a march in Manhattan from Union Square down to City Hall, distributing a leaflet calling for the cancellation of payments on the interest on city bank loans rather than laying off essential city workers. One of the speakers was David McReynolds of WRL staff.

Meanwhile, just a week earlier a local affiliate of CONEC held an impressive demonstration in Paterson. On Saturday the 21 the Passaic County Coalition for Jobs marched through the streets and held a rally with more than 200 persons. Ann Boggan, staff for CONEC, had taken a car of supporters out from Manhattan to support the march and rally. In both the Paterson and Manhattan rallies the leaflets and speakers stressed the need to slash the military budget in order to meet human needs.

IN HAWAII. . .

Photo by Ian Lind

. . . site of the Pacific's nuclear command center, WRL/Catholic Action and AFSC conducted this vigil on June 2. It took place at the federal building in downtown Honolulu to coincide with the monthly Civil Defense siren test and will be repeated each month. Leaflets explained that while the test is "a reminder that the sword of nuclear destruction hangs constantly over our heads, ". . . the vigil is a reminder that "the only real defense against destruction from nuclear war lies in the elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere and the unequivocal condemnation of the policy of nuclear war as a crime against humanity."

INDIVIDUAL ACTION

WRLer Peter Gregonis pastes the word "kill" (over what previously read "lead") on recruiting poster in Geneva, Illinois.

BACK ISSUES OF WRL NEWS

The WRL national finds itself short or out of many past issues of *WRL NEWS*. If there are any of the following issues around which can be spared we would certainly appreciate receiving them:

1972: Jan/Feb and Mar/Apr
1970: Jan/Feb, May/June, July/Aug, Nov/Dec
1969: July/Aug and Sept/Oct
1968: May/June
1967: Jan/Feb and Mar/Apr
1966: Jan/Feb
1965: Jan/Feb, May/June, July/Aug, Nov/Dec
1964: Mar/Apr, May/June, July/Aug, Sept/Oct
1963: Mar/Apr, Sept/Oct
1962 and earlier: all.

SPECIAL PRE-PUBLICATION OFFER . . .

. . .on THE POWER OF THE PEOPLE, forthcoming photo-history of nonviolence to be published by the Institute for the Study of Nonviolence in Palo Alto.

UNTIL NOV. 31 ONLY, you can get the paperback for only $3.65, the hardcover, $10.83—including postage. After publication (Jan. 1) the price will be $4.95 for the paperback, $15 for the hardcover.

By buying prior to Nov. 31, you not only will be saving money, but helping get this independent and cooperative publishing effort on the road.

Send orders to: POWER OF THE PEOPLE, Institute for the Study of Nonviolence, PO Box 1001, Palo Alto, Ca. 94302.

UNIVERSAL OR UNILATERAL DISARMAMENT?

by Otto Nathan

Since I have urged the War Resisters League for a good number of years (*WRL News*, July-August, 1969 and September-October, 1972) to become active in promoting general disarmament, I was gratified to learn from David McReynolds' article in the July-August 1974 issue of *WRL News* that the WRL has now apparently decided to turn its attention to the problem of disarmament and make it "a central issue" and possibly give it "top priority" in the work of the organization. Disarmament certainly deserves that position on the agenda of any peace organization.

I should like to make a few suggestions for the discussion that is expected to take place in the various media of WRL. David McReynolds asserts that multilateral disarmament is impossible and that the only politically realistic approach are bold unilateral initiatives directed at disarmament. I am convinced that neither multilateral nor unilateral disarmament are politically realistic. The only goal to pursue, which promises to be politically realizable, is universal and complete disarmament. It no doubt will meet very great political opposition—here and in many other countries. But while the efforts made in the past for complete disarmament offer hope that such opposition can eventually be overcome, there is virtually no such *realistic* hope for unilateral disarmament.

I share David McReynolds' belief that the fear of alleged risks plays a very large role in determining the attitudes of various nations. As the discussions and negotiations about universal disarmament in the United Nations since 1959 indicate, the risk factor can be removed only when *all* nations renounce war as an instrument of policy, commit themselves to cease production of any type of armaments as per a given date, accept a universally-worked-out plan for dismantling all their armed forces and facilities over a very limited number of years (a period of 8 to 10 years was under discussion), and create a supra-national agency for mediation and arbitration of conflicts between individual nations, for supervision of universal disarmament, and for enforcement of peace among nations, possibly with the help of an international police force which may have to exist for a certain period of time.

Is there hope for this kind of universal disarmament? Yes, there is, as there was when the Soviet Union and the United States submitted on September 20, 1961 a joint statement to the United Nations recommending a detailed plan for general and complete disarmament and when initial measures were taken by the United Nations for the development of such disarmament which were stalemated by America's war in Vietnam. There is hope since the ever increasing monstrosity of weapons for mass destruction will eventually force even the most recalcitrant nations and statesmen to realize that "security" can no longer be obtained except by total abolition of war. There is no doubt that more and more nations will develop nuclear weapons. As it has been recognized long since that there does not exist any "defense" against atomic instruments of destruction, the nightmare of threatened annihilation will no doubt cause even the Pentagon's of some countries to become "pacifists" favoring disarmament.

At the moment a particularly great obstacle to a policy of sanity and survival is the United States government. Attempts initiated originally by the Soviet Union in the United Nations almost four years ago for convening a World Disarmament Conference at an early date—to focus the attention of mankind on the urgent necessity for universal disarmament—has so far been sabotaged by the United States. The WRL and the other peace organizations should embark on a sustained campaign for universal and general disarmament by putting pressure on Congress and the Executive. Every effort should be made to bring about a change in Washington from the disastrous, insane policy of ever-increasing armaments back to the position which the United States and the Soviet Union jointly announced in the United Nations 13 years ago. Real disarmament would be the key to many other developments in society in which pacifists and all decent men devotedly believe.

FREE . . .

WRLers who have a copy of Jim Peck's autobiography, UNDERDOGS VERSUS UPPERDOGS may obtain, free, a 2-chapter supplement updating it through the end of the Vietnam war. (Please enclose a couple of stamps for postage.) . . . ☐

FOR $1.50 . . .

WRLers who do *not* have the book can buy one, including the new supplement (All proceeds to WRL). The book is a personal account of non-violent action over the years through the eyes of an active participant. . . . ☐

NAME_____

ADDRESS_____

CITY & STATE _____ZIP____

MIDWEST

COORDINATOR

NEEDED

The Plains/Midwest Regional Office is one of the largest, best organized, and most effective of the local and regional offices of WRL.

After two years of good hard organizing, the Midwest Coordinator is in need of a replacement.

The job requires experience in community organizing, outreach, speaking, office skills, etc. Low pay (200/Month), long hours. Position open Aug. 1st.

Kansas City is a growing city, with many available opportunities for creative organizing. We will help the applicant get settled, give support, etc. Please send resume to WRL Plains/Midwest, 3950 Rainbow Blvd. Kansas City, Kansas 66103.

A FOUNDER OF WRI DIES

On July 5 at Conway Hall, in London, peacepeople gathered for a memorial service for Harold Bing, a lifelong educator and a founder of War Resisters International. He died June 6 at the age of 77 at his home in East Lake.

"He has been one of the most important pacifists in the history of WRI," says the July issue of WRI NEWSLETTER. "A lifelong pacifist, Harold spent 2½ years in prison as a CO in world war 1. He was active in the NO MORE WAR movement, 1920-1938 and founder of its youth section. Active in the Peace Pledge Union since its foundation, he became one of its sponsors. He has been on the WRI Council since 1925 and was chairperson from 1950 to 1966, honorary treasurer since 1972. He never missed a Council, Executive or Triennial meeting except in the last year due to his illness."

UNILATERAL DISARMAMENT FOR ALL NATIONS: A POLICY FOR THE WRL?

by Bradford Lyttle

The WRL has always been clear about its advocacy and support of comprehensive, *personal* conscientious objection. It has not been nearly as clear in acknowledging the logical and immediate *political* implications of being a comprehensive C.O.

If a man or a woman refuses for moral reasons (moral here used in its broadest, humanitarian sense) to serve in the armed forces of any nation, under any circumstances, then that person, if not being elitist and seeking special privilege, is saying that it is wisest for no one to serve in any armed forces under any circumstances. The person is saying that all military establishments, always, are a mistake. In regard to the question of disarmament, the comprehensive pacifist has only one consistent position: to advocate unilateral disarmament for all nations.

On its surface, comprehensive unilateral disarmament may seem preposterous. How are nations, peoples, to defend themselves if they disarm? the average non-pacifist may ask. To him or her, unilateral disarmament seems suicidal. Pacifists of the 1920's often replied that military defense wasn't necessary. All wars, they said, were caused by arms races. Nations attacked each other because they feared each others' military power. If one major nation had the courage to disarm unilaterally, all nations would follow the moral example. Military establishments would then fade away, and the world would be forever peaceful. That argument always seemed unrealistic and simplistic to many people, and subsequent experiences with Nazism, Stalinism, and various forms of imperialism, such as the Vietnam War, have made universally accepted the idea that imperialism and totalitarianism possess aggressive internal dynamics that don't depend merely on arms races. Today, however, the pacifist has another argument that takes into account fascism, and aggressive totalitarianism.

This argument is the notion of defense by nonviolent resistance. Nonviolent resistance was developed first on a large, systematic scale by Gandhi. Since India won its independence, it has been used throughout the world in many situations of political struggle. A growing body of scientific, political analysis describes nonviolent resistance as a means by which a culture can effectively preserve and even extend values and institutions of political freedom and economic and social justice, without resorting to armed struggle, against the most determined and sustained attacks. Those who support military defense, and social change eventually by armed struggle, may ignore nonviolence in their own speculations, but they can no longer say that no theoretical alternative to violence exists, and they are increasingly compelled by objective analyses of concrete situations to acknowledge that "tactical" nonviolence often seems the wisest strategy. The pacifist is therefore on respectable theoretical grounds, at least, if he or she advocates for all nations unilateral disarmament and cultural defense by nonviolent resistance.

Such advocacy has great political advantages for the pacifist. It gives the pacifist an incisive tool for cutting to the heart of international conflicts. Consider the Middle East. Zionism, often cited as the "cause" of the Middle East confict, cannot be faulted for its dream of a homeland and self-determination for the Jewish people. Increasingly, all peoples are acknowledged to have the right to try and realize such dreams. Centuries of persecution, and the holocaust, make fully understandable why the Jewish people should want their own homeland. The evils of Zionism have flowed not from that dream, but from the wedding of the dream to the tool of military force. Starting in 1948, when most of the Palestinians were driven out of Palestine, and Israel was consolidated, then through the 1956, 1967, and 1973 wars, it has been Israel's armed forces and para-military bodies that have made possible and sustained Israel's aggresiveness and insensitivity to just Palestinian and Arab claims. Today, by national policy, the *only* means by which Israel retaliates against terrorism is with her military forces. Israeli jets bomb Palestinian camps. Israeli commandos assault Arab villages. On the Arab side, all of the Palestinian terrorist organizations are military in character, and all the Arab nations around Israel have grotesquely huge armies and air forces, supplied mainly by the U.S. and Russia. In the Middle East, we have counter-counter-counter terrorism, and wars-to-prevent-wars-to-prevent-wars, all escalating, and all made possible by the universal acceptance of the legitimacy of *defensive* military power.

One wonders what might have happened if Zionism had been pacifist; had pursued a course of development similar to William Penn's and the Quakers' 80 year experiment in Pennsylvania? Perhaps Israel wouldn't exist precisely as we know it today, but almost certainly the overall prospects of the Jewish people would be far brighter, and world peace would seem on firmer ground. A coherent and morally and politically appealing case can be made of proposing that Israel and the Arab nations disarm unilaterally, and prepare for nonviolent resistance rather than military defense.

The arms race between Russia and the U.S. is another problem for which unilateral disarmement can be made relevant and cogent. Twice in the 20th Century, arms races between major powers have led to world wars. Negotiations to achieve multilateral disarmament have always been firmly supported in principle by the parties to the arms races. Great powers have maintained almost continuous conferences about disarmament and arms control. Myriads of proposals have been made for arms "quotas" and inspection systems. Sometimes "pacts" have been signed, like the Washington Disarmament Conference of 1921-22, or the Geneva-Vienna agreements of the late 1960's and early 1970's. Always, these "dams" have broken, and the onrush of armaments has resumed. Currently, we are witnessing the collapse of the most recent Strategic Arms Limitation (SALT) agreements between Russia and the U.S. Missiles with MIRV warheads have been installed and have "destabilized" the "balance of terror." Nations armed with modern weapons proliferate. Negotiated disarmament, "arms control", and even "unilateral initiatives" have all failed for the same central reason. None rejects the principle of military force; to succeed, all require a degree of trust between nations that isn't reasonable and doesn't exist. In the company of disarmament theories that have repeatedly failed, unilateral disarmament at least hasn't been demonstrated to be unworkable. Strong arguments can be made that if one major culture disarmed unilaterally and prepared for defense by nonviolence, moral, political and economic forces could be generated that might induce other cultures to follow suit.

A skeptical and cautious pacifist might reply: "It would be suicidal for a pacifist organization to propose unilateral disarmament and cultural defense for all nations. The organization's "Liberal" base would evaporate." The Committee for Nonviolent Action (CNVA) vigorously projected unilateral disarmament and defense by nonviolent resistance from 1959 to at least 1964 in its anti-missile projects Omaha Action and Polaris Action, and during the San Francisco to Moscow Walk for Peace, and the Quebec-Washington-Guantanamo (Miami) Walk for Peace. Apart from its initial development around the Golden Rule's 1958 voyage to protest nuclear weapons testing, CNVA's strongest period of membership and financial growth took place during that 1959-1964 period.

CHILE—TWO YEARS LATER

By David McReynolds

On September 11, 1973, the military forces of Chile overturned the democratically elected government headed by Salvadore Allende. Allende was a Marxist, seeking to lead Chile toward a socialist society in which freedom and social justice would both survive. The military coup cut short a dramatic experiment in peaceful social change. It was no ordinary coup. Allende was killed in the Presidential Palace. Thousands of socialists, communists, trade unionists, students, and intellectuals were rounded up and summarily shot.

It was suspected at the time—and later confirmed—that the CIA and Henry Kissinger were directly involved in the coup. The U.S. has helped create an economic crisis in Chile by cutting off credit. Millions of dollars of CIA funds were spent to support the opposition and help disrupt public order in Chile. President Ford, in one of his most Orwellian remarks, justified U.S. intervention by saying it had been done to protect the free press in Chile. But the press in Chile was not in any serious danger from Allende's government and now, of course, there is no free press at all.

The most hideous tortures continue even now. People vanish and do not appear again. The prospects for a return of democracy in Chile are very dim as this is written. The Marxists who had been willing to try a peaceful approach to change may not want to take that risk again. The junta has for the moment made any legal opposition impossible and therefore has made violent resistance almost inevitable.

This article is not, however, written "in memorium" for what is finished. There has been an international struggle slowly building to isolate Chile, to cut off funds, credit, and to brand the junta for exactly what it is—an outlaw government. The WRL has been concerned with events in Chile both before and after the coup. Grace Paley and Bob Nichols had visited Chile and written about their experiences in *WIN* before the coup. They were among a number of people who had urged the WRL to send down a delegation of support for Allende's experiment—something on which there was no chance to act before the violent end of that experiment. Immediately after the coup Gertrude Rosenblum and I from WRL had called together a small meeting of Socialists, Trotskyists, and Communists, on the perhaps naive assumption that since *all* these groups had been able to cooperate in Chile in supporting Allende, that despite the disagreements among these groups in the U.S. some joint actions could be mounted here in support for victimized Allende backers who are being jailed and tortured. Unhappily that experiment failed—the U.S. groups were each more concerned with organizing a support committee which it could control. The factionalism of the American Left made impossible united support for the Allende supporters. Peace groups generally did not respond to Chile because the Vietnam War still was the main focus. It is to the credit of some of the church groups that they gave special attention to Chile from the beginning and played a broad and serious humanitarian role.

This brief article suggests several conclusions to be drawn from events in Chile. First, and for liberals the most important lesson, the coup revealed beyond any possible question the nature of American capitalism as it now operates. In Vietnam it had always been possible for liberals to argue that the Communist side did not believe in free elections, that the evils of communism were so great that it was difficult to choose between the evils of American intervention and the NLF. The war in Vietnam was nearly over before social critics such as Michael Harrington and Irving Howe finally decided that the U.S. should withdraw unconditionally. In the beginning, back in the early sixties, radical groups such as WRL which called for unconditional U.S. withdrawal were accused of being politically naive. The "anti-Communist hangover" from the McCarthy period had served to paralyze many liberals and to mask the basic reasons for U.S. intervention.

But Chile was quite clear and in that sense it was quite different. Allende had come to power through free electiions, and while he did not have a majority, his share of the votes had *increased substantially* in the first election after he took power. It was, in fact, *his increasing public support which forced the U.S. to intervene and triggered the military coup*. From the beginning Allende pledged to maintain the democratic process—and kept his pledge. Here was an example of "social change with freedom" which the U.S. government had claimed it would support. Here was a multi-party system, a free press, and religious freedom. The problem was that Allende had moved to take control of U.S. corporate holdings—the copper mines in particular. Events in Chile demonstrated beyond any question or any doubt that those who rule the American government talk about freedom only as a propaganda device—their primary and virtually only concern is with the protection of American corporate interests. When those interests were threatened, Kissinger and Ford chose terror and violence and military rule over freedom and social justice.

Second, when we talk about disarmament we cannot mean only *nuclear* disarmament, and we must not accept the ideological trap in which I feel Otto Nathan falls by discussing disarmament in terms of something so "universal" that it is virtually left in the hands of the governments, governments that have a vested interest in *not* disarming. *Disarmament is a struggle of the people against their governments*. Chile is an example of the role of *non-nuclear arms* being used to suppress social change. (Arms supplied by the U.S.). India today is another example—Newsweek, (July 7) commented that "Even if a political challenge could be mounted against her, Mrs. Gandhi has a powerful weapon—the 828,000 man Indian Army". So there, too, we find a *non-nuclear* force can be used not only against Pakistan, but also *against the revolutionary forces within India*. Finally, in 1968 the Soviet Union demonstrated its willingness to use non-nuclear arms to suppress the efforts by Czechoslovakia to create "socialism with a human face". The U.S. intervened covertly in Chile to protect its economic interests. The Soviet Union intervened directly in Czechoslovakia to protect its political interests. India may find its army used against itself to maintain one vain and frightened politician in power.

Chile, therefore, not only exposed the U.S. economic/political structure as murderous and anti-democratic, but was a reminder that *non-nuclear* weapons threaten freedom and social change. Finally, for those who felt Allende should have armed the workers and crushed the opposition, the reality was that Allende never dared to take such a move—any move to arm the workers would only have prompted an earlier military coup. Only "ultra-Leftists" who live in an unreal world could believe that Allende ever had that choice. He gambled on the strength of Chilean democracy to carry him through. He would almost certainly have won that gamble had it not been for U.S. actions. Those who want to liberate Chile, those who learned from Vietnam, should realize that it will only be by turning to the center of power in this country and disarming it that we can most effectively aid the liberation of Chile. And, *in the process* (for all history is a question of *process*, of ideas and events *in motion*) suggest to peoples elsewhere in the world that arms cannot defend them, but may too easily be used to suppress them. Chile, India, Czechoslovakia—they are linked in a special sense, that non-nuclear arms, designed to defend a nation against some external emeny, were turned against the legitimate process of domestic social change.

CARRIERS OF THE NUCLEAR DISEASE

by Robert Jay Lifton

A special feature marking the 30th anniversary of Hiroshima, this moving article is reprinted from the New York Times, *June 18, 1975.*

Last month Ichiro Moritaki, a retired professor of ethics at Hiroshima University, sat down before the Cenotaph—the monument containing the names of the atomic-bomb dead—to protest the American underground nuclear test explosion, announced the day before. I was in Hiroshima at the time, so I sat down beside him. (Photo below)

Professor Moritaki has engaged in such "sitting protests" for about twenty years, and appears regularly before the Cenotaph in response to any nuclear testing. In the past he has maintained vigils over a number of days, sometimes accompanied by fasting. Now 75 years old, he tells me, "I can still manage one or two hours quite easily."

When he first began this form of protest, Professor Moritaki emphasized its Buddhist origins, assumed a zazen position and held a Buddhist rosary. Over time he changed to a less esoteric cross-legged position, characteristic of ordinary Japanese sitting. From the beginning he and his followers have seen themselves as "sitting on behalf of the dead, two hundred thousand people, on behalf of the 'voiceless voices.' "

The silence of the protest and its obeisance to the dead has had special significance for survivors, who readily condemn more noisy demonstrations—and manipulations—of antibomb feelings as "an insult to the dead." Moritaki's sitting protest has, in fact, weathered the sectarian struggles of antibomb politics and persists as both a reminder of holocaust and an expression of human possibility.

In discussing his own persistence, Moritaki brings up his "past mistakes" as a professor of ethics who conveyed to his students such principles of prewar and wartime Japanese militarism, as unquestioning "love of nation" and "dedication to victory." But the "atonement" he speaks of has, one suspects, even more to do with his own experience as a survivor of the atomic bomb or a *hibakusha* (explosion-affected person). He underwent severe personal injuries, lost the use of one eye, and witnessed the death of many friends and relatives. He always comes back to the faces of the dead and the dying and asks that we "focus on human beings" when we think about Hiroshima. The experience has value, he says, only "if we make it valuable by what we do," adding that "if we do not make it valuable, the dead are unable to sleep in peace." Which is to say that then one is unable, psychologically, to justify one's own survival.

There is a simple principle in Professor Moritaki's protest: that of relating the atomic bomb to the human organism it threatens to extinguish. That principle is inevitably ignored in the calculations of strategists and theorists, especially when such calculations are made on behalf of the military, any military. Yet we have desperate need to hold on to this "organismic perception" if we are to mobilize the energy and wisdom to prevent nuclear extermination.

And that human-centered perception tends to be present in the few, in Hiroshima and elsewhere, who have persisted in their opposition to the weapons and to war in general. Like other such dedicated *hibakusha*, Professor Moritaki first worked with atomic-bomb orphans, and in reference to one of them and her severe keloid scars, he once said to me: "Just talking with this particular girl—only with her—you feel that we should stop the bomb."

But Professor Moritaki ponders over a question put to him by another little girl, after having observed his quiet protest: "Can you stop it by sitting?" It is hard indeed to give an affirmative answer to that question, and he is well aware that neither his delicate gesture nor anything else may succeed in "stopping it."

But he nonetheless likens his irascible persistence to that of a small child, determined to have its way despite powerful adult resistance. And indeed, even in Hiroshima where the professor is widely admired, many shake their heads sadly at the seeming futility of the act.

Yet I take Moritaki's sitting to be a dignified but profound reminder of the threat posed by our weaponry to our life as a human group, a reminder whose significance and potential power derives precisely from the place he sits, the experience he represents.

It is sometimes said of Hiroshima survivors, and of the Japanese in general, that they suffer from a "nuclear allergy." The term correctly conveys the idea of sensitivity, but implies that this sensitivity is something of an overreaction if not a disease. Professor Moritaki gently informs us, however, that it is the rest of us, in our nuclear insensitivity, who are reacting inappropriately, and carrying the nuclear disease.

Part of the disease is a peculiar madness lurking beneath the logic of international negotiations concerning who may make, test, and perhaps use how many nuclear bombs. If we are to place those negotiations on a plane of reason and life, we had better take another look at the human dimension we are ignoring—indeed at the fragility of our own existence, as expressed by Professor Moritaki sitting before the Cenotaph.